



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: Subhash C. Roy et al.

SERIAL NO.: 09/064,474

FILED: April 22, 1998

FOR: Real Time Debugger Interface  
for Embedded Systems

Honorable Commissioner of Patents  
and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

GROUP ART UNIT: 2700

EXAMINER: Stacy Whitmore

ATT'Y DOCKET: TRA-040

#12 (2783)  
IC 2700 MAIL ROOM  
AUG 24 2000  
RECEIVED  
2783-01

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited  
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in  
an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and  
Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 on AUG 15, 2000  
David P. Gordon Date Aug 15, 2000  
David P. Gordon  
Reg No. 29,996

This is a timely reply to a Final Rejection dated June 6,  
2000 (Paper #9) and an Advisory Action dated August 11, 2000  
(Paper #11). As no claims have been added, and no extension fee  
is required, no fees are enclosed herewith.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

The Examiner has refused entry of the Applicant's  
Amendment after Final on the grounds that "changing 'connected' to  
'directly coupled' would require a new search." The Applicant  
respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider his refusal for  
the following reasons.

MPEP section 904 provides that the Examiner's initial search  
"should cover the invention as described and claimed, including  
the inventive concepts toward which the claims appear to be  
directed." Section 904.01(d) cautions the Examiner that the  
initial search "should extend to all probable areas relevant to

the claimed subject matter and should cover the disclosed features which might reasonably be expected to be claimed."

It is respectfully submitted that the Applicant's Amendment (Paper #8) following the Examiner's non-final rejection clearly indicated that the Applicant intended to claim "directly coupled" and that the Examiner should have searched that at that time. It is the Applicant's understanding that in the electrical arts, the terms "coupled" and "connected" are well accepted terms of art with "connected" meaning "directly coupled". Moreover, the Applicant indicated this in the remarks section of the Amendment. Thus, the Examiner had no reason not to search on this limitation prior to issuing the Final Action.

Following the Amendment (Paper #8) wherein the Applicant changed "coupled" to "connected" and wherein the Applicant explained in the remarks section that it was intended that "connected" mean "directly coupled", the Examiner performed another search and issued a Final Action. In the Final Action, the Examiner entered a new ground for rejection and cited new art. The Examiner also noted that he did not agree with the Applicant that "connected" means the same thing as "directly coupled". It was the Applicant's understanding that the Examiner was indicating that he would allow claims which were amended to state "directly coupled" rather than "connected".

It is also not understood why the Examiner made the last action Final as he entered a new ground for rejection. If a new ground for rejection is entered, the action should only be made final if the Applicant's Amendment necessitated the new grounds. However, the new art cited by the Examiner in the Final Action was applied to claims which were not amended.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the finality of Paper #9 was improper, that the Amendment (Paper #10) did not raise new issues, should be entered, and that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



David P. Gordon  
Reg. #29,996  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

65 Woods End Road  
Stamford, CT 06905  
(203) 329-1160

August 15, 2000